

REMARKS

1. Introduction

In the non-final Office Action mailed August 18, 2005, Claims 17-21 were rejected as indefinite under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. §112. Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9 -13 and 15-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,697,354 (Borella et al. '354). Claim 8 was objected-to as patentable if rewritten in independent form.

In this Response, Applicants amend claim 17 to address the indefiniteness rejection. Further claims 1, 7, 10, 12 and 13 are also amended to clarify the range antecedents as first or second port ranges.

Independent claims 1 and 13 are amended to clarify that the registration request and reply messages are sent as part of a *mobile IP message*.

Claim 8 has been rewritten in independent form as it was objected-to (in the previous, March 30, 2005 Office Action) as patentable if rewritten in independent form.

Dependent claims 22 and 23 have also been added.

Claims 1, 3-5, 7-13, and 15-23 are thus currently pending, for a total of 20 claims of which 3 are independent.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims, as amended herein, for the reasons set forth below.

1. Response to Indefiniteness Rejection

The Examiner has rejected claims 17-21 under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim what applicants regard as the invention. As noted above, Applicants amend claim 17 to address the indefiniteness rejection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the indefiniteness rejection of claim 17-21 is withdrawn.

2. Response to § 102(e) Rejection

a. Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9-13 and 15-21

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9-13 and 15-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,697,354 (Borella et al. '354).

Borella et al. '354 do not disclose or suggest recite receiving a “*mobile IP message* comprising a registration request (or reply) message” as recited in claims 1 (or 13). Borella et al. '354 disclose a separate port allocation protocol (PAP) to set up a mobile IP session. (See Figs. 3-6, and 17-18 and Col. 21, lines 55-63 and Col. 8, lines 22+ of Borella et al. '354). The claims of the present invention instead use mobile IP messaging itself to make the registration request and reply for address management of mobile nodes.

Borella et al. '354 implement delivery of mobile IP in a different way. Claims 1 and 13 do away with the port allocation protocol. Claims 1 and 13 send it in the mobile IP messaging -- both the registration request and reply. Because the claims use mobile IP messaging for registration, and not the separate and additional port allocation protocol of Borella et al. '354, claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9-13 and 15-21 are not anticipated.

Dependent claims 3-5, 7, 9-12 and 15-21 contain the limitations of their corresponding independent claims 1 or 13 and are patentable over Borella et al. '354 for the reasons discussed above.

Furthermore, dependent claims 2-18, 20-28 and 30-38 contain additional limitations which are not taught by Borella et al. '354. For example, claim 3 recites assigning and transmitting a network address to the first mobile node; claim 4 recites that the network address is an Internet Protocol (IP) address; claim 5 recites that the network address can be shared with a second mobile node; claim 7 recites that a second port range is defined by a low port number and a high port number of globally unique port numbers to said second mobile node; claim 7 recites that the first and second port ranges are disjoint; claim 9 recites that the registration request message includes a care-of address for the first mobile node; and claims 10 and 11 recite that the care-of address is associated with the first port range of globally unique port numbers.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3-5, 7, 9-13 and 15-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,697,354 (Borella et al. '354) is respectively requested.

New dependent claims 22 and 23 respectively depend from independent claims 1 and 13. They claim that the first port range of globally unique port numbers is defined by a low port number and a high port number and the second port range of globally unique port numbers is defined by a low port number and a high port number. Dependent claims 22 and 23 are patentable because they contain the limitations of their corresponding independent claims 1 or 13 and because they contain additional limitations which are not taught by Borella et al. '354.

3. Conclusion


For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is hereby requested. Should the Examiner feel that further dialog would advance the subject application to issuance, he is invited to contact the undersigned.

The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' Representative at the below-listed telephone number if there are any questions regarding this communication.

Respectfully submitted,

MICHAEL S. BORELLA ET. AL.

By their Representatives,

By 
Daniel W. Juffernbruch
Reg. No. 33,122
847-458-6313

Patents and Licensing LLC
28 Barrington Bourne
Barrington, IL 60010-9605
tel: 847-458-6313
fax: 815-301-8408
Dan@patentsandlicensing.com

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on November 18, 2005.

Name